

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated July 28, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 28, 2008. Claims 1-2, 8-9, 14-15, 25, 34, 49, 66 and 70 have been amended to more clearly recite various aspects of the invention. Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced by the amendments presented herein. The amendments and the new claims have been made to put the claims in condition for allowance or in better condition for an appeal. Claims 30, 35-39, 64-65 and 67-68 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to subsequently take up prosecution of the claims as originally filed in this application in a continuation, a continuation-in-part and/or a divisional application. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-11, 13-18, 21, 25-31, 34-39, 49, 51, 54, 55, 58-68 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,574,723 ("Chiles"). Claim 1 has been amended to now include:

a second upper segment coupled to a second upper connection point transverse the first upper connection point on the deflector body;

a second lower segment coupled to a second lower connection point transverse the first upper connection point on the deflector body, wherein the second actuator adjusts the ratio of the lengths of the first upper segment and the second upper segment to the lengths of the first lower segment and the second lower segment to control the tilt angle of the deflector body.

These limitations were previously recited in claims 67-68, which have now been cancelled without prejudice. As such, Applicant believes that the amendment does not raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search by the Examiner.

Chiles generally describes a paravane handling system. Chiles explains that "when the operator onboard vessel 10 desires to reposition paravane 40, the operator selects the appropriate controls on the control panel onboard vessel 10 to transmit a control signal to paravane 40. The control signal is received by signal transducer 90 which in turn applies a signal to control circuit 86. Control circuit 86 in turn, outputs a

control signal to the servo motor 82 which causes winch 78 to tighten or pull in the paravane lines 36 and 38 thereby pulling the back end of paravane 40 toward the vessel to increase the angle which the main line 26 makes with vessel 10. A similar operation is implemented to decrease the angle which paravane 40 makes with the direction of travel of the vessel 10. In that situation winch 78 is operated to lengthen lines 36 and 38. In this manner the operator onboard the vessel is able to selectively vary the angle of attack or incidence of paravane 40 in the water and thus alter the relative position of the paravane with respect to the vessel." (See column 5, lines 1-20). However, Chiles does not teach or disclose "wherein the second actuator adjusts the ratio of the lengths of the first upper segment and the second upper segment to the lengths of the first lower segment and the second lower segment to control the tilt angle of the deflector body," as newly recited in claim 1. Chiles mentions nothing about a ratio of lengths, let alone about adjusting the ratio of lengths to control a tilt angle of the deflector body. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Chiles. Claims 2-11, 13-18, 21, 25-29, 31, 34 are also patentable over claim 1 since they depend from claim. Claims 30 and 35-39 have been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection moot with respect to those claims.

Claim 49 has been amended to now include:

providing a bridle that defines first and second segments extending between a cable connection point and respective upper left and upper right rotatable towpoints on the deflector and third and fourth segments extending between the cable connection point and respective lower left and lower right rotatable towpoints on the deflector; and

adjusting the ratio of the lengths of the first and second segments to the lengths of the third and fourth segments to control the tilt angle between the deflector and the tow cable.

These limitations were previously recited in claims 64-65, which have now been cancelled without prejudice. As such, Applicant believes that the amendment does not raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search by the Examiner. As in claim 1, Chiles also does not teach or disclose "adjusting the ratio of the lengths of the first and second segments to the lengths of the third and fourth segments to control the tilt angle between the deflector and the tow cable." Chiles mentions nothing about a ratio of lengths, let alone about adjusting the ratio of lengths

to control a tilt angle between the deflector and the tow cable. Accordingly, claim 49 is patentable over Chiles. Claims 51, 54-55, 58-63, 66 and 70 are also patentable over claim 49 since they depend from claim. Claims 64-65 and 67-68 have been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection moot with respect to those claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiles in view of US Patent No. 6,598,554 ("Lasky"). Neither Chiles nor Lasky, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses "wherein the second actuator adjusts the ratio of the lengths of the first upper segment and the second upper segment to the lengths of the first lower segment and the second lower segment to control the tilt angle of the deflector body," as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, there is no suggestion discerned in Chiles or Lasky of modifying the devices or methods disclosed therein in the direction of claim 1, nor is there any suggestion of the desirability of such modifications. Since claims 12 and 24 depend from claim 1 and since neither Chiles nor Lasky, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 1, claims 12 and 24 are therefore also patentable over Chiles and Lasky. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiles in view of US Patent No. 6,028,817 ("Ambs"). Neither Chiles nor Ambs, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses "wherein the second actuator adjusts the ratio of the lengths of the first upper segment and the second upper segment to the lengths of the first lower segment and the second lower segment to control the tilt angle of the deflector body," as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, there is no suggestion discerned in Chiles or Ambs of modifying the devices or methods disclosed therein in the direction of claim 1, nor is there any suggestion of the desirability of such modifications. Since claims 19-20 depend from claim 1 and since neither Chiles nor Ambs, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 1, claims 19-20 are therefore also patentable over Chiles and Ambs. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-23, 32-33 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiles in view of US Patent No. 5,357,892 (“Vatne”). Neither Chiles nor Vatne, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses “wherein the second actuator adjusts the ratio of the lengths of the first upper segment and the second upper segment to the lengths of the first lower segment and the second lower segment to control the tilt angle of the deflector body,” as recited in claim 1 and “adjusting the ratio of the lengths of the first and second segments to the lengths of the third and fourth segments to control the tilt angle between the deflector and the tow cable,” as recited in claim 49. Furthermore, there is no suggestion discerned in Chiles or Vatne of modifying the devices or methods disclosed therein in the direction of claims 1 and 49, nor is there any suggestion of the desirability of such modifications. Since claims 22-23, 32-33 and 56 depend from claims 1 and 49 and since neither Chiles nor Vatne, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claims 1 and 49, claims 22-23, 32-33 and 56 are therefore also patentable over Chiles and Vatne. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ari Pramudji/ Date: September 29, 2008  
Ari Pramudji  
Registration No. 45,022  
PRAMUDJI WENDT & TRAN, LLP  
1800 Bering, Suite 540  
Houston, Texas 77057  
Telephone: (713) 468-4600  
Facsimile: (713) 980-9882  
Attorney for Assignee